



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

well as *-e*.² This last is intelligible as it has the pronominal ending *-ammi* as a point of departure, whereas in the case of Śaurasenī there is none. And it should be noted that in Māhārāṣṭrī *i* and *u* stems the same analogical extension takes place, thus *girimmi*, *pahummi*. Accordingly either Māhārāṣṭrī, as the literary Prākṛit *par excellence*, has influenced Śaurasenī, or else Mārkaṇḍeya has made a mistake, or else the manuscripts of his grammar are to be corrected, for forms such as **aggissim* and **vāussim* in Śaurasenī would be natural analogical extensions, having pronominal *-ssim* as the point of departure. Observe that Pischel quotes no actual form in the literature for the Śaurasenī locative singular of *i* stems and but two (in *-uṇi*) for that of *u* stems. Till we have further materials it is impossible to decide with absolute certainty which of the above hypotheses is correct; but the first is the most likely.

TRUMAN MICHELSON

Bureau of American Ethnology,
Washington, D. C.

*On the doubling of consonants in the seam of certain
Pāli compounds*

anuddayā, 'compassion': Skt. *anu*+*dayā*.
paṭikkūla (beside *paṭikūla*), 'contrary': Skt. *prati-kūla*.
abhikkanta, 'lovely': Skt. *abhi*+*kānta* (not *abhi-krānta*; cf. Childers s. v., and Geiger, *Pāli Grammatik*, in the *Grundriss*, §33, p. 53).

paribbūha, 'strong', etc.: Skt. *pari-br̥ḥa*.
vikkhāyitaka, one of the ten *asubha kammaṭṭhānas*, obtained by contemplation of a corpse gnawed by beasts of prey: Skt. *vi-khādītaka* (with Prākṛitic loss of *d*; etymology guaranteed by simple *khāyita*, 'eaten'; Geiger, *op. cit.* § 36, p. 55).

More or less plausible attempts have been, or may be, made to explain the double consonant in some (or even possibly all) of these words individually. Thus Anderson suggests that *anuddayā* is influenst by *niddaya* = *nirdaya* (the analogy is imperfect, since *anuddayā* is a noun, *niddaya* an adjective and a bahuvrīhi

² In Māgadhī the regular ending of *a* stems for the locative singular is *-e*; in verse the Māhārāṣṭrism *-ammi* also occurs: see Pischel, §366^a. Similarly *-ammi* in Amg.: the regular terminations in Amg. are *-e* and *-am̐si*.

cpd.), and that *paṭikkūla* goes back to an imaginary Skt. **pratīkūla* (which theory is the less likely because Pāli *paṭikūla* is also actually found). One might possibly—at a pinch—think of influence from the homonym *abhikkanta*=*abhikrānta* ‘advanst’ in the case of *abhikkanta* ‘lovely’, and of a vague influence from the root *kṣi* in *vikkhāyitaka*.

But a unitary explanation is always preferable in the case of a group of forms showing such obviously similar phenomena. Meter cannot be concerned; the words occur predominantly in prose. The iambic law is not likely to apply; in four out of the five words quoted above the next syllable is long. Such suggestions as the influence of recessive accent (Geiger *op. cit.* §24, p. 49) are most dubious; many of the forms quoted under this rubric can be explained otherwise, and the whole idea seems to me not much more than a *petitio principii*. I think that most of the ‘vowel-lengthenings’ in the seam of compounds mentioned in Geiger §33, p. 53, are different in character (e. g. *sakhībhāva*, cf. the *ī* regular in compositions of root *bhū* and their derivatives, Whitney *Gr.* §1094; *rajā-* in *rajāpatha* stands for Skt. *rajah*, which rules it out; etc.).

I suggest that the explanation is this. There were countless cases in Pāli in which a simple ‘root’ beginning in one consonant appears to begin with a double consonant as soon as it is compounded. Of course, the original Sanskrit had two consonants in both cases. E.g. Pāli *kama*=Skt. *krama*, but *anukkama*=*anukrama*. From the point of view of Pāli—which neither knows nor cares what the Sanskrit had—such forms suggest that the second element of a (primarily verbal! see below) compound should have its initial single consonant doubled. It is a case of proportional analogy: *kama:anukkama*=*dayā:anuddayā*.

It is quite to be expected that this phenomenon should be nearly or quite restricted to verb-compounds and their noun derivatives, or at least to words which look like derivatives of compound verbs, because their prior member is a preposition. For in noun compounds, even when the second element originally began with two consonants, we find it frequently beginning with only one in Pāli, as is well known. This is of course due to the comparative looseness of noun, as contrasted with verb, composition; noun compounds tend more to behave like separate words. Yet note *jātassara* ‘natural lake’: Skt. *jāta-saras* (Geiger, *op.cit.* §33, p. 53).

The list given at the head of this Note does not by any means

claim to be exhaustiv. I am certain that there ar other cases: these ar simply the most certain instances of those which I hav discovered, mainly from the lexicons and vocabularies. Systematic serch of the texts will undoubtedly bring to light more. Before closing I should like to refer to a few more questionable cases.

paggharati, 'trickles', would be a case in point if from Skt. *pra-ghr*; no forms of root *ghr* occur with two initial consonants. But the derivation cannot be considered certain. Geiger (*op.cit.* §56. 2, p. 67) derives from Skt. *kṣar*, and deduces (apparently from forms of this root and *jhā=kṣā*, 'burn', alone) a fonetic law which seems to me to hav a rather questionable basis, positing a special treatment of *kṣ* in Pāli-Prākṛit when *kṣ*=Indo-Iranian *ǰz*. It must be admitted that Prākṛit *pajjharai* lends some support to this theory.

vissussati, 'is dried up', Skt. *vi-śuṣ*, is quoted by Childers from a single passage only, and there, as Ch. notes, it is immediately preceded by *ussussati*; the *ss* may be due to direct influence from this adjoining form. Yet I suspect that the case belongs under my rule. Other occurrences, if there ar any, would presumably decide.

Compounds beginning with *su-* followd by a doubled consonant ar open to the suspicion of having been influenst by their opposits in (Sanskrit) *dus-*; e.g. *subbaca*: Skt. *su-vacas*: *subbatta*, *suppatha*. So also *suddiṭṭha* according to Anderson, *JPTS* 1909 p. 193: *su-drṣṭa* (which seems a more likely derivation than that of Geiger, *op.cit.* §24 n. 1, p. 49, from *su+uddiṭṭha*=Skt. *uddiṣṭa*).

Compounds of the Skt. root *srj* and their derivativs, showing *ss* (e. g. *vissajjati*), hav no dout been partly influenst by Sanskrit forms beginning in *sr* (āor. *asrākṣīt* etc.); they would then be blend forms (*sraj* and *sarj*). Yet it seems possible that such forms as these may hav helpt in the creation of the psychological predisposition to double an initial consonant of a root preceded by a preposition.

Probably not pertinent at all ar such forms as *okkatṭha*: Skt. *avakṛṣṭa* and the like; they presumably involv mere compensatory lengthening of the consonant attendant on shortening of the o-vowel.

Certainly not pertinent ar blend forms like *upakkilesa*: Skt. *upakleśa* (blend of **upakkesa* and **upakilesa*), *sassirika*: Skt. *saśrīka* (blend of **sassika* and **sasirīka*), etc.

Finally, the question would naturally arise whether the Prākṛit dialects show tendencies of this same sort. I have examined this question in a somewhat superficial way, but do not feel like expressing an opinion. The matter of doubling of consonants in Prākṛit is much more confused than in Pāli, and requires a special study.

The tendency which I assume never acquired anything like universal prevalence in Pāli. But this cannot be counted as a disproof of the thesis. Pāli fonology is full of such tentative leads, never fully carried out.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

University of Pennsylvania

On a possible Pre-Vedic Form in Pāli and Prākṛit

The Pāli-Prākṛit root *kaḍḍh*, 'draw', 'plow', is the lexical equivalent of Sanskrit *karṣ*, *krṣ*,¹ but cannot be derived from its presumptive source by any known fonetic process. Analogical infection, or blend with any other root does not suggest itself, tho possibilities of that sort are not entirely precluded by mere negation. But it is possible to explain root *kaḍḍh* by an historical process of another kind.

The 'root-determinative' *d* attaches itself with great predilection in the Aryan tongues to roots ending in sibilants. Thus in Vedic the root *īḍ* = *iṣ-d*, from *iṣ* (*ichati*), for which see *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 1906, pp. 13 ff.²; *pīḍ* = *piṣ-d* (*JHUC*. l. c.) from *piṣ*, 'crush' (*πιέζω* has nothing to do with the case); *mīḍ*, from **mīḍ* = *miṣ-d* from *miṣ*, both in the sense of 'shut the eyes' (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* i. 221 ff.).

Some of those formations are Indo-Iranian, or even Indo-European: Avestan *khraoḍdaiti*, 'harden', *khruḍda*, 'hard'; Sanskrit *krūḍayati*, 'thicken', *kroḍas*, 'breast': Greek *κρυσ-ταίνω*, 'congeal'. Sanskrit *heḍ*, *hīḍ*, 'hate', Avestan *zoīḍda*, 'ugly', OHG. *geist* (cf. ON. *geisa* 'be infuriated'): Goth. *usgaisjan*, 'make beside one's self'. Especially as regards the sounds *ḍd*, preceded by *r*, cf. Aryan *mṛḍ*, in Sanskrit *mṛḍ*, Avestan *mərəḍd* 'pity', either from root *mṛṣ*, 'forget', or I.-E. *mṛḡ* 'wipe off'.

¹ Hemacandra 4. 187; the basis *kaḍḍh* is probably continued in the modern Hindu dialects; e. g., in Marāṭhī *kāḍhnem*; see Bloch, *Langue Marathe*, §§112, 231, and p. 308.

² Persistent identifications with Lat. *aestumo*; Goth. *aīstan*; OHG. *ēra*; or with Skt. *yajati* (*iṣṭa-*) are all wrong.